

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, consideration of the veto message on H.R. 956 will be postponed until Thursday, May 9, 1996, and, upon further consideration of the veto message on that day, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the question of passage of the bill, the objections of the President to contrary notwithstanding, without intervening motion or debate, except 1 hour of debate on the question of passage.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 417, PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR EXPENSES OF SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES ROLE IN IRANIAN ARMS TRANSFERS TO CROATIA AND BOSNIA

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight may have until midnight tonight, May 6, 1996, to file a report on House Resolution 417, providing amounts for the expenses of the Select Subcommittee on the United States Role in Iranian arms transfers to Croatia and Bosnia of the Committee on International Relations in the Second Session of the 104th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE PRETEND PRESIDENT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is just pretending to be President. He is just pretending to propose solutions to our Nation's problems. Let me illustrate what I mean.

Take the issue of helping the working poor. The President, by proposing an increase in the minimum wage, has a pretend solution to a real problem. Raising minimum wage will cause job loss and won't help the working poor. Even President Clinton agrees. He said so in Time magazine in 1995. If President Clinton thought raising the minimum wage was a good idea, he should have raised it when the Democrats had control of the Congress during the first 2 years of his term. He didn't. I can only conclude that the President doesn't want to help the working poor, only wants to pretend to help.

Another recent example of pretending is the announcement that he will sell 12 million barrels of oil from the strategic petroleum reserve in an effort to reduce rising gasoline prices. Twelve million barrels sounds like a lot of oil, but it is less than a day's supply for the Nation. The sale of oil will have a neg-

ligible effect on prices. If he wanted a real solution to a real problem, he would support repeal of his 4.3 cents a gallon gasoline tax of 1993. However, President Clinton would rather make a bold announcement and pretend to do something about rising gas prices.

We need a President that has real solutions for real problems. Not a President who is playing "let's pretend."

MEDICARE TRUSTEES REPORT

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Medicare trustees reported last year that the part A trust fund, covering all inpatient hospital care, would be bankrupt by the year 2002, essentially confirming the findings of the Kerrey Commission. However, in light of new Treasury Department estimates that the trust fund ran a \$4.2 billion deficit through the first half of fiscal year 1996, experts, including the former Chief Actuary to HCFA, now conclude that the trust fund could be bankrupt in the year 2000, just 4 years from now. These facts should propel the administration to join the congressional initiatives to preserve Medicare. Instead, the April 1 deadline for this year's trustees report has come and gone with no White House action. It seems the White House is employing stalling tactics and stonewalling Medicare reform rather than saving the program. I urge the President to shelve the excuses, produce the report and join with the efforts currently underway in Congress to save Medicare now. Our Nation's seniors and others dependent on Medicare cannot tolerate the same White House failures to fix Medicare that we have endured for the last 4 years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 1, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall votes 141 through 145.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on votes 141, 142, 144, and 145. I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 143.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE THING THAT WILL NOT DIE—REPUBLICANS' PLAN TO CUT EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DeLauro] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, increasingly the extreme agenda of the gen-

tleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and his leadership team reminds me of a bad 1950's B movie plot: The thing that would not die. They continue to resurrect bad ideas that have rightfully been shot down because in fact they have hurt working families in this country.

The latest example of a bad idea that will not stay dead is the House Republicans' plan to cut education.

It was only about 2 weeks ago when Speaker GINGRICH and other congressional Republicans waved the white flag and surrendered their extreme position on cutting education. They proposed making the deepest cuts in the history of public education in this Nation, totaling \$3.1 billion, and it took the outrage of parents and teachers and students at the grassroots level in addition to the determination of the President, of the congressional Democrats, to force Republican leadership to stop this wrongheaded attitude and attack on our Nation's future.

But let me say that parents do not rest easy. No sooner do we think that this bad idea is dead and buried, that then it finds new life.

Yesterday House Majority Leader DICK ARMEY proposed cutting education to pay for the repeal of the gas tax. I quote:

But the fact of the matter is, given our ability to contain the cost of energy and give tax relief, maybe we ought to take another look at the amount of money we are spending on education.

Direct quote: I watched the program.

Now I support a cut in the gas tax and would vote for such a thing. But who is going to get the benefit of it? Is the consumer going to get the 4.3 cents, or is that money going to go into the pockets of big oil?

That is what the danger is here, and what is going to get cut in order to pay for that tax cut? The last thing I want to see is a political game being played that does not really save the consumers any money in the end.

Is it not funny that when the increase, when it goes up, when the stock market goes up in its price, and the gas prices go up at the pump, when that goes down, when the stock market goes down, is it not funny that the gas prices for consumers and for families grudgingly comes down and takes a very, very long time for it to do it?

If we are going to cut the gas tax, then we should have the big oil companies pay for that gas tax cut and not education programs that serve working families in this country.

The other thing that we ought to consider at the same time is how come the prices rose so quickly, how come all the prices went up at the exact same time with the exact amount of increase? Is not that strange?

Let us take a look at and investigate that portion of this debate.

Let me just say that instead of cutting corporate pork the gentleman from the big oil State of Texas proposes cutting education for our kids to